

**REMARKS**

Applicant submits that the present amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated July 3, 2008 and, thus, the application is in condition for allowance.

By this response, no claims are amended. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11-16, and 18 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 7, and 11 are independent. An expedited review and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery (US 6,011,975) in view of Kauser (US 5,724,660). It is asserted that Emery substantially discloses a method and system according to the present invention as recited in the claims, but for storing a table at a mobile switching center and using odd numbers for wireline customers and even numbers for distinguishing wireline and wireless numbers. It is further alleged that Kauser does disclose this deficiency and the combination of these cited references would have therefore been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Emery nor Kauser, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. For example, Emery fails to teach or suggest any kind of element for distinguishing a wireless number from a wireline number. Emery at most discloses using an AIN network to provide services for both wireline and wireless devices, such as a Centrex system for use with wireline and wireless devices. A scheme such as that claimed in the present invention is necessary such that a user knows whether they are dialing a wireless telephone or a wireline telephone. For example, the user may be trying to reach a co-worker after business hours. A call to a wireline telephone would likely not reach the co-worker as the co-worker has left the office. Therefore, because the

user knows the co-worker has probably left for the day, the user would dial the even number associated with the co-worker to call the co-worker's wireless telephone. Without this feature, the user would be forced to dial each number, not knowing which is wireline and which is wireless, wasting time and possible expense. The closest Emery comes to this feature is just the ability to connect to the wireless device, without knowing it is a wireless device. Additionally, Emery does not teach storing the table at the mobile switching center or the communications element. Any tables present in Emery are stored centrally. In the event of any disconnection between this central storage and the mobile switching center or communications element, Centrex services to devices utilizing these elements would not work. The storage at the outer elements is important to the functioning of the system and would not have been obvious due to Emery. The storage specifically solves a problem that may occur in Emery, by enhancing reliability. The storage entails a necessary memory used for storing the table in the mobile switching center or communications element, extra memory that was not contemplated in Emery. Therefore, Emery does not disclose each element of the previous invention.

Furthermore, Kauser fails to cure the deficiencies in Emery because Kauser does not disclose a numbering scheme for differentiating wireline from wireless devices or the storage of the table at the mobile switching center or communications element. Kauser discloses determining the location of a wireless device. The invention entails a wireless device dialing a telephone number and the system determining where the wireless device is. The fact that the device is wireless is already known. Calls from the device reach the mobile switching center, part of a wireless network. A user is not trying to differentiate between calling a wireless device and a wireline device, but the location of a wireless device. The numbering schemes in Kauser are used such that calls from one certain number to another certain number will automatically

begin the location. This is very different than the present invention, where a wireless extension is an even number and a wireline extension is an odd number such that the type of device will be apparent to a user. Additionally, it is not even asserted by the Examiner that Kauser discloses storing a table at the mobile switching center or communications element. Therefore, Kauser cannot cure the deficiencies of Emery.

Thus, neither Emery nor Kauser, alone or in combination, teach or fairly suggest all of the elements in the independent claims. Hence, the dependent claims, which depend therefrom, also are patentability distinct from any related art of record. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine any of these references outside of Applicant's own disclosure. Even if they were combinable, *arguendo*, the combination would not be able to obviate the present invention for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, the rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

A THREE (3) month extension of time is hereby requested to enter this amendment. If any fees are associated with the entering and consideration of this amendment, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account 50-2882.

Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner to present more evidence of the unique attributes of the present invention in person. As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2009

/Fariborz Moazzam, Reg. No. 53,339/

Fariborz Moazzam

Reg. No. 53,339

Cust. No. 65,667

MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC

7601 Lewinsville Road, Suite 304

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 442-9480

(703) 991-5978 (fax)